APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/580,327	05/26/2000	Ralf D. Steinbach	020431.0698	8166

7590   08/13/2002

Baker Botts LLP
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER
WASSUM, LUKE S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 May 2000</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>26 May 2000</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

     a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u> .   6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1.   Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement, filed 15 February 2001, has been received and

considered. See attached form PTO-1449.

Drawings

2.   This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination

purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Specification

3.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because in line 9, the data management system is

referred to with reference number 22, while on the corresponding drawing Figure 2 the data

management system is referred to as reference number 20. Correction is required. See MPEP

§ 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - *35 USC § 102*

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States
before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has
fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by
the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999

(AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was

not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b).

Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA

(pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5.   Claims 1-16, 18-30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Taylor**

et al. (U.S. Patent 6,256,676).

6.   Regarding claims 1, 18 and 32, **Taylor et al.** teaches a system and method for retrieving data

from a database using a data management system as claimed, comprising:

    a) a change retrieval engine coupled to the data management system and operable to:

        i) determine that data in the database managed by the data management system has

        been changed (see col. 3, line 61 through col. 4, line 4; see also col. 18, lines 13-

        18);

        ii) receive information from the data management system identifying one or more

        categories with which the change data is associated (see col. 15, line 50 through

        col. 16, line 49; see also col. 17, lines 11-25; see also col. 18, lines 13-18);

        iii) access a data model to identify data to be retrieved from the database using the

        data management system according to the retrieved information, the data model

        identifying data related to the categories (see col. 15, line 50 through col. 16,

        line 49; see also discussion of message definition objects, col. 15, lines 50-55);

        iv) request the data identified by the data model from the data management system

        (see col. 15, line 50 through col. 16, line 49; see also col. 18, lines 13-18);

    v) receive the data from the data management system (see col. 15, line 50 through col.

      16, line 49; see also col. 18, lines 13-18);

    vi) store the data in a data log (see col. 15, line 50 through col. 16, line 49; see also col.

      14, lines 60-62);

    vii) communicate a transfer command (see col. 15, line 50 through col. 16, line 49; see

      also col. 18, lines 13-18); and

  b) a change transfer engine coupled to the change retrieval engine and operable to:

    i) receive the transfer command (see col. 15, line 50 through col. 16, line 49; see also

      col. 18, lines 13-18);

    ii) obtain the data from the data log (see col. 15, line 50 through col. 16, line 49; see

      also col. 18, lines 13-18); and

    iii) communicate the data to an external system (see col. 15, line 50 through col. 16,

      line 49; see also col. 18, lines 13-18).

7. Regarding claims 2 and 19, **Taylor et al.** teaches a system and method for retrieving data as

claimed, wherein the data management system comprises an enterprise resource planning (ERP)

system and the external system comprises an external planning system (see Figure 1; see also col. 2,

lines 42-64; see also col. 7, line 7 through col. 8, line 20; see also col. 10, lines 3-64).

8. Regarding claims 3, 4, 20 and 21, **Taylor et al.** teaches a system and method for retrieving

data as claimed, wherein the change retrieval engine is further operable to monitor the data

management system or receive a message to determine when a change document is created, the

change document indicating that data managed by the data management system has been changed

(see col. 3, line 60 through col. 4, line 4; see also col. 18, lines 13-18).

9.   Regarding claims 5-7 and 22-24, **Taylor et al.** teaches a system and method for retrieving

data as claimed, wherein the categories comprise business objects, identified in the data model by a

business object name or the name of a main table of data associated with the business object (see

discussion of the system as a business system, col. 1, line 35 through col. 6, line 55; see also col. 17,

lines 17-40; see also Figure 9).

10.   Regarding claims 8 and 25, **Taylor et al.** teaches a system and method for retrieving data as

claimed, wherein the change retrieval engine is further operable to receive one or more key values

from the data management system, each key value identifying an instance of the business object for

which data was changed (see col. 15, lines 50-55).

11.   Regarding claims 9-12 and 26-29, **Taylor et al.** teaches a system and method for retrieving

data as claimed, wherein:

        a) the data model identifies one or more tables managed by the data management system

                from which to retrieve data (see col. 15, line 50 through col. 16, line 49; see also col.

                17, lines 11-54; see also col. 17, lines 11-40; see also Figure 9);

        b) the change retrieval engine is further operable to request data from the tables that are

                associated with one or more instances of a business object, the instances of the

                business object identified by one or more key values received from the data

management system (see col. 15, line 50 through col. 16, line 49; see also col. 17, lines

11-54; see also col. 17, lines 11-40; see also Figure 9);

c) the change retrieval engine is further operable to apply field reductions to the data

identified by the data model, the field reductions indicating one or more fields of the

tables containing desired data (see col. 15, line 50 through col. 16, line 49; see also col.

17, lines 11-54; see also col. 17, lines 11-40; see also Figure 9);

d) the change retrieval engine is further operable to apply field filters to the data identified by

the data model, the field filters indicating the desired data in the tables (see col. 15,

line 50 through col. 16, line 49; see also col. 17, lines 11-54; see also col. 17, lines 11-

40; see also Figure 9); and

e) the data identified by the data model to be retrieved from the data management system

further includes data related to the changed data (see col. 17, lines 11-54).

12.   Regarding claims 13-16 and 30, **Taylor et al.** teaches a system and method for retrieving

data as claimed, wherein the change transfer engine is further operable to:

a) access a distribution model to determine one or more serialization groups into which the

data identified by the data model is to be divided (see col. 15, line 50 through col. 16,

line 49; see also col. 17, lines 11-54; see also col. 4, lines 40-49);

b) store the data received and the destination information in the data log according to the

serialization groups (see col. 15, line 50 through col. 16, line 49; see also col. 17, lines

11-54; see also col. 4, lines 40-49; see also col. 14, lines 53-62);

c) access the distribution model to determine destination information for one or more

external systems to which the data in the serialization groups is to be communicated

(see col. 15, line 50 through col. 16, line 49; see also col. 17, lines 11-54; see also col. 4,

lines 40-49); and

d) communicating the serialization groups to the external systems identified by the

destination information, the data in each serialization group communicated to the

associated external system in an order that the data in the database was changed (see

col. 15, line 50 through col. 16, line 49; see also col. 17, lines 11-54; see also col. 4,

lines 40-49).

Claim Rejections - *35 USC § 103*

13.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section
> 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the
> subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

14.   Claims 17 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Taylor et**

al. (U.S. Patent 6,256,676) as applied to claims 1-16, 18-30 and 32 above, and further in view of

Chang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,308,178).

15.   Regarding claims 17 and 31, **Taylor et al.** teaches a system and method for retrieving data

substantially as claimed, including a means for handing errors detected in the agent-adapter between

enterprise applications and the system (see col. 34, lines 17-18; see also col. 35, lines 47-51).

Taylor et al. does not explicitly teach a system and method for retrieving data wherein an error log is created if the data is not communicated to the external system, and the error is communicated to the external system before communicating additional data.

Chang et al., however, teaches a system and method for retrieving data wherein an error log is created if the data is not communicated to the external system, and the error is communicated to the external system before communicating additional data (see discussion of the validator, col. 9, lines 26-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to communicate errors in transmission to the external system, since this would allow the external system to take some remedial action to resynchronize the data between the two systems, and furthermore because in the absence of such a message the external system would be out of sync with the server, and would have the potential to present erroneous data to a user.

Conclusion

16.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Notani et al. (U.S. Patent 6,332,130) teaches a system for retrieving data from a database using a data management system, including the use of model agents to maintain partial replicas of the database on external systems by forwarding changed data to said external system if the data is subscribed to by the external system.

Notani et al. (U.S. Patent 6,222,533) teaches a system for retrieving data from a database using a data management system, including the use of model agents to maintain partial replicas of the database on external systems by forwarding changed data to said external system if the data is subscribed to by the external system.

Notani et al. (U.S. Patent 5,995,945) teaches a system for retrieving data from a database using a data management system, including the use of model agents to maintain partial replicas of the database on external systems by forwarding changed data to said external system if the data is subscribed to by the external system.

Notani et al. (U.S. Patent 5,931,900) teaches a system for retrieving data from a database using a data management system, including the use of model agents to maintain partial replicas of the database on external systems by forwarding changed data to said external system if the data is subscribed to by the external system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luke S. Wassum whose telephone number is 703-305-5706. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

In addition, INFORMAL or DRAFT communications may be faxed directly to the examiner at 703-746-5658.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Luke S. Wassum
Art Unit 2177

lsw
August 8, 2002

JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100